

REMARKS

Several arguments exist to overcome the examiner's objections to the unpatentability of the method claims at issue, which objections are respectfully traversed.

As set forth in applicant's claim 1, the present invention includes **coating the rawhide chew toys with meat**. This feature is not seen in the art of record nor in any combination of the art of record. Attached hereto as "Fig. 1" is a picture of a product in accordance with the present invention. Duensing et al. disclose combining a marinade containing additives with rawhide to attract the animal. Sherrill et al. ('938) disclose an animal chew toy formed from combining rawhide bits and jerky pieces, the jerky meat being processed with spices and/or marinade for flavoring, which is expected to improve the taste of the meat. This is not "coating the rawhide with meat," as claimed. Attached hereto as "Fig. 2" is a picture of the product in accordance with the Sherrill et al ('938) patent. Sherrill et al. ('653) disclose a chew toy having a sheet of rawhide and a sheet consisting of jerky meat, wherein the jerky meat is wrapped in the rawhide. Attached hereto as "Fig. 3", is a picture of the product in accordance with the Sherrill et al. ('653) patent. This is not applicant's claimed invention. Jerky meat wrapped in rawhide is not "coating the rawhide with meat," as claimed.

The examiner admits that Duensing et al. do not show coating meat on the rawhide. Instead, Duensing et al. disclose rawhide combined with a marinade. The combination of Duensing et al. and either Sherrill et al. reference does not give rise to applicant's claimed method. Sherrill et al. ('938) disclose jerky meat **interspersed within and mixed with rawhide bits**, but Sherrill et al. ('938) do not teach coating the rawhide with meat. The Examiner's combination merely gives rise to adding the marinade into the jerky meat to attract the animal. This is not applicant's claimed method. In contrast, applicant's method for producing a chew toy includes forming a rawhide chew toy, preparing meat, processing the meat, coating the rawhide with meat and drying the rawhide chew toy

coated with meat. As indicated, neither Sherrill et al. reference nor any art of record discloses coating the rawhide chew toy with meat and drying the rawhide chew toy coated with meat. The process of mixing the jerky meat with the rawhide bits is unquestionably different from coating the rawhide with meat. Since the combination relied upon by the examiner does not give rise to applicant's claimed invention, there is no question here of obviousness. The art does not suggest coating the rawhide with the meat.

Applicant's invention achieves advantages over the art. Sherrill et al.'s animal chew toy is composed of many small pieces of rawhide so that the animal chew toy may be consumed quickly. An advantage of the product resulting from applicant's claimed method is that the resulting rawhide chew toy provides an entire piece of rawhide so the animal can not easily swallow the rawhide.

As a result of the foregoing, applicant submits that claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels would best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Dated: April 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By William E. Pelton

William E. Pelton, Esq.

Reg. No. 25,702

Cooper & Dunham LLP

1185 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036

(212) 278-0400

Attorneys for Applicant